

### REMARKS

In response to action of October 4, 2006, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-28 are currently pending, of which claims 1-6 are independent. Claims 5, 6 and 12 have been amended, and claims 25-28 have been added. Support for claim amendments to claims 5 and 6 and the new claims may be found in the application at, for example, page 9, lines 1-9 and FIGS. 2C and 3A.

Claims 1-6 and 19-24 have been rejected as unpatentable over Tsunoda (U.S. Patent No. 5,064,275) in view of Kamijima (U.S. Patent No. 7,088,417). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Tsunoda nor Kamijima alone disclose the subject matter of independent claims 1-6 and the combination of Tsunoda nor Kamijima is improper, as described more fully below. The action acknowledges that Tsunoda does not disclose all of the limitations of independent claims 1-6 and relies on Kamijima for disclosing various features recited in independent claims 1-6.

More particularly, the action indicates that "Tsunoda does not specifically disclose the claimed plurality of light-emitting elements each having a luminescent material sandwiched between a pair of electrodes having light-transmittivity [that] are arranged in the display means." Action at page 2, lines 16-20 (with regard to independent claims 1, 2, 5 and 6) and page 4, lines 1-5 (with regard to independent claims 3 and 4). For this feature, the action relies on a combination of Kamijima with Tsunoda, indicating:

Since Tsunoda discloses a liquid crystal display that includes a pair of electrode surfaces that operate with a plurality of light-emitting devices, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of sandwiching the light-emitting elements between a pair of electrodes as well as providing a luminescent material for each of the light-emitting elements, as disclosed by Kamijima, to ensure that the image is displayed on a selected pixel in a selected line as well as enhancing reliability with the luminescent material.

Action at page 3, lines 7-13. However, Kamijima's disclosure of sandwiching the light-emitting elements between a pair of electrodes as well as providing a luminescent material for each of the light-emitting elements cannot be properly combined with Tsunoda's display device.

First, the combination of Tsunoda and Kamijima, as proposed by the action, would render Tsunoda's display device inoperable. More particularly, Tsunoda discloses a liquid crystal display device, which includes a light-emitting device 9 provided on substrate 11. *See* Tsunoda at FIG. 1. Tsunoda's light-emitting device 9 "cooperates with an optically activated switch in the liquid crystal display device 10 and produces a preferably infrared invisible optical beam which turns on and off the optically activated switch which cooperates with the electrode in the display device 10." *See* Tsunoda at col. 7, lines 21-26. Kamijima discloses an active-matrix EL device that includes an "EL element 203 [that] is a light emitting element having a structure in which an EL layer containing a luminescent layer is held between an anode and a cathode." Kamijima at col. 30, lines 46-48. *See also* Kamijima at FIGS. 23-25; col. 29, lines 35-37; and col. 30, lines 49-52.

Combining Kamijima's light-emitting element into Tsunoda's liquid crystal display device renders Tsunoda's device inoperable because the EL element provided in the display pixel of Kamijima would not function in the light-emitting device of Tsunoda *provided on the substrate* to optically activate switches in Tsunoda's liquid crystal display device. Accordingly, the combination of Tsunoda and Kamijima is improper.

Second, one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to combine the structure of Kamijima's light-emitting element with Tsunoda's liquid crystal display device. Contrary to assertions made in the action, Tsunoda does not suggest that the light-emitting device should be modified with luminescent material, such as taught by Kamijima, to ensure that an image is displayed on a selected pixel in a selected line as well as enhance reliability with a luminescent material. Nor does Kamijima suggest that luminescent material should be used to modify a light-emitting device, such as disclosed by Tsunoda, to ensure that an image is displayed on a selected pixel in a selected line as well as enhance reliability with a luminescent material. As such, nothing in Tsunoda or Kamijima would have provided motivation the structure of Kamijima's light-emitting element in Tsunoda's liquid crystal display device.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 and their respective dependent claims 19-24.

Claims 7-18, each of which depends from one of independent claims 1-6, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Tsunoda in view of Kamijima and Kaspar (U.S. Patent No. 5,631,638). Kaspar, which is cited in the action for disclosing a display for a motor vehicle's rearview mirror, does not remedy the failure of Tsunoda and Kamijima, alone or in any proper combination, to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1-6. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7-18.

New claims 25-28 each depend from one of independent claims 1-4, respectively. At least for the reason of that dependency and the reasons noted above with respect to independent claims 1-4, applicant submits that claims 25-28 are allowable.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the action dated October 4, 2006, be extended for one month to and including February 4, 2007.

Applicant : Yasuko Watanabe et al.  
Serial No. : 10/820,810  
Filed : April 9, 2004  
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-227001 / US7089

The fee in the amount of \$320 in payment of the for excess claim fees (\$200) and for the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$120) is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/5/07

  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Customer No. 26171  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331